

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for kindly considering the proposed amendment in a phone conversation on October 14, 2004, wherein the incorporation of limitations of the original Claim 17 into the original Claim 1 was discussed. In accordance with the conversation with the Examiner, the limitations of the original Claim 17 are herein incorporated into the original Claim 1, the original Claim 19, and the original Claim 20. The Office Action of August 25, 2004, has been carefully considered as follows.

Amendments

The specification has been amended in paragraph 0023 to correct "a inlet adapter" to read "an inlet adapter".

Claim 18 is herein amended to depend from Claim 1.

Claims 1, 19, and 20 have been amended to add an additional limitation: "reliefs in the inner tube, wherein the reliefs are substantially parallel to the vanes"

No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claim 18 was objected to due to the lack of antecedent basis for "the reliefs."

Claim 18 is herein amended to depend from Claim 1, and Claim 1 is herein amended to

introduce reliefs. Applicant believes this objection is thereby overcome, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this objection to Claim 18 and advance Claim 18 toward allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as unpatentable over Wright (US 1,797,310). The original Claim 17 was objected to and would have been allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 1 is herein amended to include the limitations of the original Claim 17. Applicant believes that the amended Claim 1 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 and advance Claim 1 toward allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 - 16, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Wright (US 1,797,310). Because Claims 2 - 16 depend from Claim 1, and because Applicant believes Claim 1 as amended herein is now in condition for allowance, Applicant further believes that Claims 2 - 16 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 2 - 16 and advance Claims 2 - 16 toward allowance.

Claims 19 and 20 are herein amended to include the limitations in the original Claim 17. Because Claim 17 was objected to and would have been allowable if rewritten in independent form, and because Claims 19 and 20 include the limitations of the original Claim 1, Applicant believes that Claims 19 and 20 are now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 19 and 20 and advances Claims 19 and 20 toward allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 17 and 18 were objected to but would have been allowable if rewritten in independent form. The limitations of Claim 17 have been copied into Claim 1, and Claim 17 has been cancelled. Because Claim 18 depend from Claim 1, and because Applicant believes Claim 1 as amended herein is now in condition for allowance, Applicant further believes that Claim 18 is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 18 and advances Claim 18 toward allowance.

CONCLUSIONS

Claims 1 - 16 and 18 - 20 remain pending. Claim 17 has been cancelled.

Applicant has amended Claims 1, 19, and 20 to include the limitations of the original Claim 17 which was objected to and would have been allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner advance Claims 1 - 16 and 18 - 20 to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



KENNETH L. GREEN
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 44,724

Averill & Varn
8244 Painter Avenue
Whittier, CA 90602
(562) 698-8039